

AFFIDAVIT

I, WILLIAM W. HARPER, being first duly sworn, depose
as follows:

1. I am a resident of the State of California and for
approximately thirty-seven years have lived at 615 Prospect Boulevard
in Pasadena, California.

2. I am now and for thirty-five years have been engaged
in the field of consulting criminalistics.

3. My formal academic background includes studies at
Columbia University, University of California at Los Angeles and
California Institute of Technology where I spent four years, including
studies in physics and mathematics with the major portion devoted to
physics research.

4. My practical experience and positions held include
seven years as consulting criminalist to the Pasadena Police Depart-
ment where I was in charge of the Technical Laboratory engaging in
the technical phases of police training and all technical field investiga-
tions including those involving firearms. I was, during World War II,
for three years in charge of technical investigation for Naval Intelli-
gence in the 11th Naval District, located at San Diego, California.

After my release from the Navy, I entered private
practice as a consulting criminalist. Extending over a period of 35
years I have handled roughly 300 cases involving firearms in homicides,

suicides and accidental shootings. I have testified as a consulting criminalist in both criminal and civil litigations and for both defense and prosecution in both State and Federal Courts. I have qualified as an expert in the courts of California, Washington, Oregon, Texas, Nevada, Arizona and Utah. I am a Fellow of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.

5. During the past seven months I have made a careful review and study of the physical circumstances of the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy in Los Angeles, California. In this connection I have examined the physical evidence introduced at the trial, including the Sirhan weapon, the bullets and shell cases. I have also studied the autopsy report, the autopsy photographs, and pertinent portions of the trial testimony.

6. Based on my background and training, upon my experience as a consulting criminalist, and my studies, examination and analysis of data related to the Robert F. Kennedy assassination, I have arrived at the following findings and opinions:

A. An analysis of the physical circumstances at the scene of the assassination discloses that Senator Kennedy was fired upon from two distinct firing positions while he was walking through the kitchen pantry at the Ambassador Hotel. FIRING POSITION A, the position of Sirhan, was located directly in front of the Senator, with Sirhan face-to-face with the Senator. This position is well established by more than a dozen eyewitnesses. A second firing position FIRING

POSITION B, is clearly established by the autopsy report. It was located in close proximity to the Senator, immediately to his right and rear. It was from this position that 4 (four) shots were fired, three of which entered the Senator's body. One of these three shots made a fatal penetration of the Senator's brain. A fourth shot passed through the right shoulder pad of the Senator's coat. These four shots from Firing Position B all produced powder residue patterns, indicating they were fired from a distance of only a few inches. They were closely grouped within a 12 inch circle.

In marked contrast, the shots from FIRING POSITION A produced no powder residue patterns on the bodies or clothing of any of the surviving victims, all of whom were walking behind the Senator. These shots were widely dispersed.

Senator Kennedy received no frontal wounds. The three wounds suffered by him were fired from behind and he had entrance wounds in the posterior portions of his body.

B. It is evident that a strong conflict exists between the eyewitness accounts and the autopsy findings. This conflict is totally irreconcilable with the hypothesis that only Sirhan's gun was involved in the assassination. The conflict can be eliminated if we consider that a second gun was being fired from FIRING POSITION B concurrently with the firing of the Sirhan gun from FIRING POSITION A. It is self-evident that within the brief period of the shooting (roughly 15 seconds) Sirhan could not have been in both firing positions at the same time.

No eyewitnesses saw Sirhan at any position other than FIRING POSITION A, where he was quickly restrained by citizens present at that time and place.

C. It is my opinion that these circumstances, in conjunction with the autopsy report (without for the moment considering additional evidence), firmly establish that two guns were being fired in the kitchen pantry concurrently.

D. There is no reasonable likelihood that the shots from FIRING POSITION B could have been fired by a person attempting to stop Sirhan. This is because the person shooting from FIRING POSITION B was in almost direct body contact with the Senator. This person could have seen where his shots would strike the Senator, since the fatal shot was fired (muzzle) from one to three inches from the Senator's head. Had Sirhan been the intended target, the person shooting would have extended his arm beyond the Senator and fired directly at Sirhan. Furthermore, two of the shots from FIRING POSITION B were steeply upward; one shot actually penetrating the ceiling overhead.

E. The police appear to have concluded that a total of eight shots were fired with seven bullets accounted for and one bullet unrecovered. This apparent conclusion fails to take into account that their evidence shows that a fourth shot from FIRING POSITION B went through the right shoulder pad of the Senator's coat from back to front. This shot was fired from a distance of approximately one inch according to the

testimony. It could not have been the shot which struck Victim Paul Schrade in the forehead since Schrade was behind the Senator and traveling in the same direction. The bullet producing this hole in the shoulder pad from back to front could not have returned by ricochet or otherwise to strike Schrade in the forehead. This fourth shot from FIRING POSITION B would indicate 9 (nine) shots were fired, with two bullets unrecovered. This indication provides an additional basis for the contention that two guns were involved, since the Sirhan gun could have fired only 8 (eight) shots.

F. The prosecution testimony attempted to establish that the Sirhan gun, and no other, was involved in the assassination. It is a fact, however, that the only gun actually linked scientifically with the shooting is a second gun, not the Sirhan gun. The serial number of the Sirhan gun is No. H53725. The serial number of the second gun is No. H18602. It is also an Iver Johnson 22 cal. cadet. The expert testimony, based on matching the three test bullets of Exhibit 55 in a comparison microscope to three of the evidence bullets (Exhibit 47 removed from the Senator, Exhibit 52 removed from Goldstein and Exhibit 54 removed from Weisel) concluded that the three evidence bullets were fired from the same gun that fired the three test bullets of Exhibit 55. The physical evidence shows that the gun that fired the three test bullets was gun No. H18602, not the Sirhan gun. Thus, the only gun placed at the scene by scientific evidence is gun No. H18602. Sirhan's gun was taken from him by citizens at the scene. I have no information regarding the background

history of gun No. H18602 nor how the police came into possession of it.

G. No test bullets recovered from the Sirhan gun are in evidence. This gun was never identified scientifically as having fired any of the bullets removed from any of the victims. Other than the apparent self-evident fact that gun No. H53725 was forcibly removed from Sirhan at the scene, it has not been connected by microscopic examinations or other scientific testing to the actual shooting.

H. The only reasonable conclusion from the evidence developed by the police, in spite of their protestations to the contrary, is that two guns were being fired in the kitchen pantry of the Ambassador Hotel at the time of the shooting of Senator Kennedy.

I. From the general circumstances of the shooting the only reasonable assumption is that the bullet removed from victim Weisel was in fact fired from the Sirhan gun. This bullet is in near perfect condition. I have, therefore, chosen it as a "test" bullet from the Sirhan gun and compared it with the bullet removed from the Senator's neck. The bullet removed from the Senator's neck, Exhibit 47, was one of those fired from FIRING POSITION B, while the bullet removed from Weisel, Exhibit 54, was one of those fired from FIRING POSITION A, the position of Sirhan. My examinations disclosed no individual characteristics establishing that Exhibit 47 and Exhibit 54 had been fired by the same gun. In fact, my examinations disclosed that bullet Exhibit 47 has a rifling angle approximately 23 minutes (14%) greater than the rifling angle of bullet Exhibit 54. It is, therefore, my opinion that bullets 47 and 54 could not have been fired from the same gun.

The above finding stands as independent proof that two guns were being fired concurrently in the kitchen pantry of the Ambassador Hotel at the time of the shooting.

J. The conclusions I have arrived at based upon my findings are as follows:

- (1) Two 22 calibre guns were involved in the assassination.
- (2) Senator Kennedy was killed by one of the shots fired from FIRING POSITION B, fired by a second gunman.
- (3) The five surviving victims were wounded by Sirhan shooting from FIRING POSITION A.
- (4) It is extremely unlikely that any of the bullets fired by the Sirhan gun ever struck the body of Senator Kennedy.
- (5) It is also unlikely that the shooting of the Senator could have accidentally resulted from an attempt to shoot Sirhan.

Dated: December 28, 1970.

William W. Harper

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
 ss.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

On this _____ day of December, 1970, before me appeared, personally, WILLIAM W. HARPER, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged that he executed the same.

Notary Public in and for said County and State.

(Seal)